

|   |                        |                     |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|   | 09/848,121             | KRALL ET AL.        |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|   | Kennedy Schaetzle      | 3762                |

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Allowed

(1) Kennedy Schaetzle.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Wayne House.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 31 August 2005

**Time:** 12:30 PM

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1, 8, 22, 29, 42, 44

Prior art documents discussed:

*Hoffmann et al. 5,902,329; Shapland et al. 5,807,306; Krotz et al. 2005/0164283*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The porosity of polymer hydrogels was discussed, with the examiner bringing the Shapland and Krotz references to the applicants' attention to show that hydrogels are porous and thus that the Hoffmann et al. reference would read on the applicants' independent claims. The examiner suggested incorporating the subject matter of claim 8 into claim 1 to avoid an art rejection based on Hoffmann et al. Applicant agreed to make the change and pursue the original subject matter in a continuation application..